

10/730,864

PATENT

RESPONSE

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 are rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 19. Reconsideration and re-examination of pending claims 1-23 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections based on 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mastie et al, 6,373,585

Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 applicant contends that Mastie fails to teach, describe, or suggest the claim element of assigning screen ownership based on the number of graphics processing units that are enabled.

All dependent claims, being based on allowable base claims, are themselves allowable.

Claim Rejections based on USC 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastie in view of Talnykin 6,714,200. Applicant respectfully disagrees. These dependent claims, being based on an allowable base claim, are allowable.

10/730,864

PATENT

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-23 are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that pending claims 1-23 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner  
LLP

Date: March 1, 2005

By:



J. D. Harriman II  
Reg. No. 31,967